



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/785,658

02/23/2004

Sang-Jin Park

21C-0093

2674

23413 7590 08/15/2007
CANTOR COLBURN, LLP
55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH
BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002

EXAMINER

SCHECHTER, ANDREW M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2871

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/15/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/785,658

Applicant(s)

PARK ET AL.

Examiner

Andrew Schechter

Art Unit

2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 11-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 11 and 17-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Request for Continued Examination

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 22 June 2007 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 22 June 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The applicant argues [p. 8] that *Kubo* does not teach an opening window, and that the gaps shown in *Kubo's* Fig. 2 are spaces between adjacent pixel electrodes, not windows as required by the amended claims. The examiner agrees with this interpretation of the term "window", which requires essentially that the claimed reflective electrode must surround the opening considered to be the window. This excludes from the scope of the claim devices in which the light sensing portion is exposed to light passing between two reflective electrodes only. The examiner notes that the reflective

Art Unit: 2871

electrode and window are not shown at all in the present Fig. 6, but Fig. 5 shows a single reflective electrode RE with gaps for windows W1 and W2.

The applicant argues [p. 8] that there is no motivation to combine the reflective electrode of *Kubo* with the array of *Hack*. This is not persuasive. Such a motivation was clearly stated in the previous grounds of rejection, for instance that using *Kubo's* reflective electrode provides a transmission-reflection LCD with desirable properties.

The examiner agrees that the recitation of an "opening window" distinguishes over the prior art of the previous rejection. However, new rejections are made below in view of *Yamasaki* which contains such a reflective electrode with an opening window disposed over a light sensing portion.

Specification

3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3, 7, 11, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yamasaki et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,236,063 in view of *Shimada et al.*,

Art Unit: 2871

U.S. Patent No. 5,910,829 in view of *Hack et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,204,661 in view of *Street et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,920,401 in view of *Kubo et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,195,140.

Yamasaki discloses [see Fig. 7, for instance] a display device of displaying images in response to image and control signals, comprising: a display surface [inherent] through which input light is applied from an external object [col. 7, lines 66-67], a color filter [col. 4, line 7, col. 7, line 39]; a substrate including a plurality of pixel portions [see Fig. 1, for instance] and at least one light sensing portion [721, etc.], the at least one light sensing portion including multiple light sensing portions [see Fig. 1] each of which is disposed at an area having a selected number of the pixel portions, a reflective electrode [724] disposed on at least a portion of the pixel electrode, and wherein the reflective electrode includes an opening window [726] disposed over the light sensing portion.

Yamasaki does not explicitly disclose that the color filter should have color pixels that are arranged to form a planar surface substantially parallel with the display surface, the color pixels including red, green, and blue color pixels. *Shimada* discloses [see Figs. 16-19] an analogous device in which the color filter has red, green, and blue pixels arranged in this way. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the color filter of *Shimada* in the device of *Yamasaki*, motivated by the well-known use of these three types of color pixels to create full-color images and *Shimada's* teaching that its color filter substrate conveniently provides light blocking [see abstract].

Yamasaki does not explicitly disclose that the light sensing portion is disposed to face corresponding to the red color pixel, the at least one light sensing portion sensing light provided through the corresponding red color pixel, and wherein a number of the light sensing portions is smaller than a number of the pixel portions in a unit area. *Hack* teaches that

“by placing a color filter over individual sensors... it would be possible to selectively sense light of particular wavelengths. By blue filtering a pixel, for instance, the pixel will become relatively insensitive to red light input. This may be valuable in digitizing color images, distinguishing between different “color” light pens in a multi pen system, or other application where color differentiation is important.” [col. 11, lines 20-44]

Thus, *Hack* explicitly states the example of a blue color pixel corresponding to the at least one light sensing portion. However, in its use of “for instance”, in referring to “different ‘color’ light pens”, and insofar as there are only three primary colors red, green, and blue, this passage also clearly gives explicit fruition to red filtering a pixel. At the very least, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to red filter a pixel, based on *Hack*’s teaching that it would be valuable in digitizing color images, in using a multi-pen system, etc. The examiner notes that when red-filtering, the light sensing portion is only at 1 in 3 pixel portions, so the number of light sensing portions is smaller than a number of the pixel portions in a unit area.

Yamasaki also does not disclose wherein further, the light sensing portions each have a size smaller than a size of the respective pixel portions. *Yamasaki* appears to be silent on the relative sizes of the light sensors and the pixel electrodes. *Street*

Art Unit: 2871

discloses an analogous device, combining an LCD and an image sensor [see Fig. 5, for instance, col. 7, lines 1-37], and teaches the benefit using high sensitivity sensors, so that "a sensor size of no more than 10x10 microns is needed, and the sensor array can be a small fraction of the pixel size" [col. 7, lines 29-37]. This clearly benefits the display in that having a large pixel size and small sensor size improves the aperture ratio of the display device. *Street* further states that the "high sensitivity simplifies the readout electronics" [col. 7, line 37]. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the light sensing portions be highly sensitive and smaller than the pixel portion size as in *Street*, motivated by the desire for high aperture ratio and by *Street's* teaching that this improves the readout electronics.

Yamasaki does not disclose a transparent electrode disposed above at least a portion of the pixel portion, with the reflective electrode disposed on at least a portion of the transparent electrode. *Yamasaki* does actually disclose forming a transparent electrode on the windows [col. 8, lines 1-2], but is silent on having the reflective electrode disposed on the transparent electrode [rather than vice versa, for instance]. *Kubo* discloses [see Figs. 1 and 2] a transparent electrode disposed above at least a portion of the pixel portion, with the reflective electrode disposed on at least a portion of the transparent electrode. *Kubo* also discloses both of the two arrangements referred to above [compare Figs. 49B and 50B, for instance], which evidences that they are considered equivalents in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to arrange the two electrodes this way, motivated by

Kubo's teaching that this is an effective way to arrange the electrodes and that this and the alternative are considered art-recognized equivalents.

Claim 1 is therefore unpatentable.

Yamasaki discloses a liquid crystal layer disposed between the color filter and the substrate, so claim 2 is also unpatentable. When red-filtering a pixel, red light is provided to the at least one light sensing portion only through the red color pixel, so claim 3 is also unpatentable. The plurality of pixel portions are arranged in a matrix form to display images in accordance with the image and control signals, so claim 7 is also unpatentable. There is a gate line, a data line, a first switching member having a conduction path between the data line and a pixel electrode, the first switching member being controlled by the gate signal [see Fig. 1 of *Yamasaki*], so claim 11 is also unpatentable. Each of the color pixels in *Shimada* has a stripe shape extended in a predetermined direction between opposite ends of the color filter, so claim 18 is also unpatentable. The opening window is disposed over and directly over a TFT of the light sensing portion [see Fig. 7], so claims 19 and 20 are also unpatentable. [The examiner notes that the light sensing portion includes the TFT with elements [708, 712-714, etc.], and the opening is directly over at least 713; the examiner does not interpret "directly over" to require that the window overlap the entire TFT or that no part of the window does not overlap the TFT.]

6. Claims 1-3, 7, 11, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hack et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,204,661 in view of *Kubo et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,195,140, in view of *Shimada et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,910,829, in view of

Art Unit: 2871

Street et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,920,401, and further in view of *Yamasaki et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,236,063.

Hack discloses [see Fig. 2, for instance] a display device for displaying images in response to image and control signals, comprising, a display surface [inherent] through which input light [col. 11, lines 20-44] is applied from an external object ["light pens", for instance]; a color filter having color pixels that are arranged to form a planar surface substantially parallel with the display surface and a substrate [inherent] including a plurality of pixel portions, a least one light sensing portion [12] disposed to face corresponding one of the color pixels, the at least one light sensing portion sensing light provided through the color pixel [col. 11, lines 20-44], the at least one light sensing portion including multiple light sensing portions each of which is disposed at an area having a selected number of the pixel portions [for instance, 1 or 2 pixel portions, see col. 11, lines 53-55], wherein the number of light sensing portions can be smaller than a number of pixel portions in a unit area [when they are arranged "in, say, every other cell", see col. 11, lines 53-55, then a unit area of 2 pixel portions contains 1 light sensing portion and 2 pixel portions].

Hack discloses that there is an electrode (the pixel electrode) [col. 5, lines 47-64], but does not disclose that there is a transparent electrode disposed above at least a portion of the pixel portion and a reflective electrode disposed on at least a portion of the transparent electrode, as recited. *Kubo* discloses [see Figs. 1 and 2, for instance] an analogous active matrix LCD, in which there is a transparent electrode [21] disposed above at least a portion of the pixel portion, and a reflective electrode [23] disposed on

Art Unit: 2871

at least a portion of the transparent electrode. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use such transparent and reflective pixel electrodes disposed as recited in the device of *Hack*, motivated by the teaching of *Kubo* that this provides a transmission-reflection LCD which has low power consumption in bright surroundings and high visibility in dark surroundings [cols. 1-2], while avoiding problems in prior art devices using semi-transmission electrodes [see Fig. 52 and discussion thereof], and achieving high brightness and effective use of display regions [col. 10, lines 27-57].

Hack does not disclose the color pixels including red, green, and blue color pixels. *Shimada* discloses [see Figs. 16-19] an analogous device in which the color filter has red, green, and blue pixels. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the color filter of *Shimada* in the device of *Hack*, motivated by the well-known use of these three types of color pixels to create full-color images and *Shimada*'s teaching that its color filter substrate conveniently provides light blocking [see abstract].

Hack does not explicitly state that the at least one light sensing portion corresponds to a red color pixel. *Hack* teaches that

"by placing a color filter over individual sensors... it would be possible to selectively sense light of particular wavelengths. By blue filtering a pixel, for instance, the pixel will become relatively insensitive to red light input. This may be valuable in digitizing color images, distinguishing between different "color" light pens in a multi pen system, or other application where color differentiation is important." [col. 11, lines 20-44]

Thus, *Hack* explicitly states the example of a blue color pixel corresponding to the at least one light sensing portion. However, in its use of “for instance”, in referring to “different ‘color’ light pens”, and insofar as there are only three primary colors red, green, and blue, this passage also clearly gives explicit fruition to red filtering a pixel. At the very least, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to red filter a pixel, based on *Hack*’s teaching that it would be valuable in digitizing color images, in using a multi-pen system, etc. The examiner notes that when red-filtering, the light sensing portion is only at 1 in 3 pixel portions, so the number of light sensing portions is smaller than a number of the pixel portions in a unit area.

Hack also does not disclose wherein further, the light sensing portions each have a size smaller than a size of the respective pixel portions. As discussed previously, in the context of *Hack*, this is satisfied if the light sensing portion is smaller than the respective pixel electrode. *Hack* appears to be silent on the relative sizes of the light sensors and the pixel electrodes. *Street* discloses an analogous device, combining an LCD and an image sensor [see Fig. 5, for instance, col. 7, lines 1-37], and teaches the benefit using high sensitivity sensors, so that “a sensor size of no more than 10x10 microns is needed, and the sensor array can be a small fraction of the pixel size” [col. 7, lines 29-37]. This clearly benefits the display in that having a large pixel size and small sensor size improves the aperture ratio of the display device. *Street* further states that the “high sensitivity simplifies the readout electronics” [col. 7, line 37]. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the light sensing portions be highly sensitive and smaller than the pixel portion size as in

Art Unit: 2871

Street, motivated by the desire for high aperture ratio and by *Street's* teaching that this improves the readout electronics.

The above device does not disclose that the reflective electrode includes an opening window disposed over the light sensing portion. *Yamasaki* discloses [see Fig. 7] an analogous device with a reflective electrode [724] including an opening window [726] disposed over the light sensing portion. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have such a window, motivated by the desire to allow light to pass through the window of the reflective electrode to reach the sensor [col. 7, lines 61-67].

Claim 1 is therefore unpatentable.

Regarding claim 2, *Hack* discloses a liquid crystal layer over the substrate [col. 5, lines 50-51] and a color filter [col. 11, line 25], but does not specifically disclose that the liquid crystal is between the color filter and the substrate [that is, the color filter and the substrate could both be on the same side of the liquid crystal rather than as recited]. *Shimada* discloses [see Fig. 1, for instance] an analogous LCD with the substrate having the TFT circuitry and the color filter substrate on opposite sides of the liquid crystal. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to do so in the device of *Hack*, motivated by the manufacturing advantage of being able to produce the substrate with the circuitry and a separate substrate with the color filters, as is conventionally done in the art, thus allowing use of existing facilities and processes. Claim 2 is therefore unpatentable.

When red-filtering a pixel, red light is provided to the at least one light sensing portion only through the red color pixel, so claim 3 is also unpatentable. The plurality of pixel portions are arranged in a matrix form to display images in accordance with the image [Ds] and control [An] signals, so claim 7 is also unpatentable. There is a gate line [An], a data line [Ds], a first switching member [40] having a conduction path between the data line and a pixel electrode [the electrode on the TFT side of 42], the first switching member being controlled by the gate signal, so claim 11 is also unpatentable. Each of the color pixels in *Shimada* has a stripe shape extended in a predetermined direction between opposite ends of the color filter, so claim 18 is also unpatentable.

7. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hack, Kubo, Shimada, Street, and Yamasaki* as applied above, and further in view of *Matsumoto et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 4,097,128.

Hack and *Shimada* do not explicitly disclose that the red light has a wavelength range from about 600nm to about 700nm. *Matsumoto* discloses [col. 20, lines 1-2] that this wavelength range produces a distinct red light. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use this range of wavelengths, motivated by the desire to produce a distinct red light. Claim 4 is therefore unpatentable.

8. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hack, Kubo, Shimada, Street, and Yamasaki* as applied above, and further in view of *Cook*, US 2002/0021291.

Hack in view of *Shimada* does not explicitly disclose having the external light be white (a functional limitation as this does not affect the structure of the display device).

Cook discloses a stylus (light pen) for such an LCD, and discloses that the LED generating the light for this stylus may be white [paragraphs 0028-0030]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use white light, since some of the light would therefore be able to pass through red, green, and blue color filters and reach the respective light sensing portions. Claim 5 is therefore unpatentable.

9. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hack*, *Kubo*, *Shimada*, *Street*, and *Yamasaki* as applied above, and further in view of *Matsumoto et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 4,097,128.

Hack discloses that the input light from the external object can be red (for instance, when red filtering in a multi-pen system, as discussed above), but does not explicitly disclose that the red light has a wavelength range from about 600nm to about 700nm. *Matsumoto* discloses [col. 20, lines 1-2] that this wavelength range produces a distinct red light. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use this range of wavelengths, motivated by the desire to produce a distinct red light. Claim 6 is therefore unpatentable.

10. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hack*, *Kubo*, *Shimada*, *Street*, and *Yamasaki* as applied above, and further in view of *Huang et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,099,185.

Hack discloses [col. 11, lines 31-32] having the external object be a light pen, but does not explicitly disclose it having a light emitting diode [LED] to generate the input light. *Huang* discloses a color light pen such as that referred to by *Hack*, in which the light is generated by LED [see abstract]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to do so in the device of *Hack*, motivated by the ability of such LED chips to generate the appropriately-colored lights in a small, light-weight pen-holder to facilitate the convenient usage of the light pen. Claim 17 is therefore unpatentable.

11. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yamasaki, Shimada, Hack, Street, and Kubo* as applied above, and further in view of *Matsumoto et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 4,097,128.

The above references do not explicitly disclose that the red light has a wavelength range from about 600nm to about 700nm. *Matsumoto* discloses [col. 20, lines 1-2] that this wavelength range produces a distinct red light. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use this range of wavelengths, motivated by the desire to produce a distinct red light. Claim 4 is therefore unpatentable.

12. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yamasaki, Shimada, Hack, Street, and Kubo* as applied above, and further in view of *Cook*, US 2002/0021291.

The above references do not explicitly disclose having the external light be white (a functional limitation as this does not affect the structure of the display device). *Cook*

Art Unit: 2871

discloses a stylus (light pen) for such an LCD, and discloses that the LED generating the light for this stylus may be white [paragraphs 0028-0030]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use white light, since some of the light would therefore be able to pass through red, green, and blue color filters and reach the respective light sensing portions. Claim 5 is therefore unpatentable.

13. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yamasaki, Shimada, Hack, Street, and Kubo* as applied above, and further in view of *Matsumoto et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 4,097,128.

Hack discloses that the input light from the external object can be red (for instance, when red filtering in a multi-pen system, as discussed above), but does not explicitly disclose that the red light has a wavelength range from about 600nm to about 700nm. *Matsumoto* discloses [col. 20, lines 1-2] that this wavelength range produces a distinct red light. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use this range of wavelengths, motivated by the desire to produce a distinct red light. Claim 6 is therefore unpatentable.

14. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yamasaki, Shimada, Hack, Street, and Kubo* as applied above, and further in view of *Huang et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,099,185.

Hack discloses [col. 11, lines 31-32] having the external object be a light pen, but does not explicitly disclose it having a light emitting diode [LED] to generate the input light. *Huang* discloses a color light pen such as that referred to by *Hack*, in which the

Art Unit: 2871

light is generated by LED [see abstract]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to do so in the device of *Hack*, motivated by the ability of such LED chips to generate the appropriately-colored lights in a small, light-weight pen-holder to facilitate the convenient usage of the light pen. Claim 17 is therefore unpatentable.

15. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hack*, *Kubo*, *Shimada*, *Street*, and *Yamasaki* as applied above, and further in view of official notice.

Hack does not explicitly disclose that the light sensing portion [16] is a thin film transistor. The examiner takes official notice that use of TFTs as such light sensing elements [as done in the present invention] are well-known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use such a TFT as a light sensing portion, motivated by it being easy to manufacture such elements using familiar materials and processes in the LCD art. With a TFT as the light sensor, it would naturally have been necessary to place the opening window directly over the TFT in order to allow light to reach the light sensor, so claims 19 and 20 are unpatentable.

Election/Restrictions

16. Claims 12-16 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 11 August 2005.

Art Unit: 2871

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Schechter whose telephone number is (571) 272-2302. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Nelms can be reached on (571) 272-1787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Andrew Schechter
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2800
9 August 2007